



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,577	12/09/2005	Noel William Lovisa	340512-900306	4467
73230	7590	11/18/2009		
DLA PIPER US LLP 1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 400 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067-6023			EXAMINER LINDSEY, MATTHEW S	
			ART UNIT 2451	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/18/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION**

1. Claims 1-25, 27-32, 35-39, 42-44 and 47 have been finally rejected, for the reasons stated below, the rejection is maintained.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6 November 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicant argues that Hanagan does not disclose or suggest that each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective components (see pgs 15-16). Specifically applicant argues: "If a request is made to implement a component in the system described by Hanagan, the request would not need to include an indication of the interconnections of the respective component, since the interconnections between components are static and defined by the system architecture" (pg 16, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, lines 2-5).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The system of Hanagan allows the service requestor to select which new components will be implemented and which legacy components will be kept, this in itself selection indicates the interconnections of the respective components. For example, choosing to replace a rating engine and bill generation process while maintaining existing customer care, financials management

order processing and network access systems (as disclosed in [0089]-[0090]) indicates different connections between components than choosing to replace only the customer care system (as disclosed in [0093]-[0094]). The selection of new components and/or legacy components is an indication of the interconnections of the respective components.

4. Applicant further argues: "claim 1 requires that the 'user defined interconnections' define 'transfer of data between the entities of the respective components'. It is respectfully submitted that a user defined event link is not equivalent to an interconnection that defines transfer of data between components as required by claim 1, and therefore it is submitted that Gangopadhyay does not disclose 'user defined interconnections' in accordance with the claims" (pg 17, lines 5-10).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 is rejected by a combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay, the particular limitation of interconnections that define transfer of data between the entities of respective components is rejected by Hanagan, [0054], lines 4-8, where components are modular and can integrated into a system where they work together and [0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined. The use of Gangopadhyay was to reject the limitation of user defined interconnections, not that these interconnections define the transfer of data between entities.

5. Applicant further argues: "the event links described in Gangopadhyay do not indicate interconnections of components, but the flow of events, and it is respectfully submitted that modifying Hanagan to allow a user to model an event flow would not help to preserve modularity or ease the integration of legacy and new components" (pg 17, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The links of Gangopadhyay are links between components and therefore interconnections of components. See Col. 1, line 66-Col. 2, line 5, where event links connect nodes, and thus are user defined interconnections of components.

6. Applicant further argues: "The standardized interfaces allow legacy systems to be substituted for components of the system without requiring any interconnections to be defined. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a skilled person would not be motivated to consider allowing the user to define interconnections graphically as per the Examiner's reasoning" (pg 18, lines 7-8).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The substitution of systems is defining the interconnections of the components. By selecting which components are to be replaced and which are to be kept, the interconnections between components are defined. Allowing a user to select which components to replace/keep graphically means the user has defined the connections between components. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to combine the references because it is easier to visualize the system with a graphical representation.

7. Applicant further argues: "If the system of Hanagan was modified to allow user defined links as per Gangopadhyay, it is submitted that the components of Hanagan would not be appropriately configured to allow any interconnections other than those that are predetermined by the static architecture, and therefore the user defined interconnections would not work to provide any further functionality beyond the original design of Hanagan" (pg 18, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. By selecting which components are to be replaced and which are to be kept, the interconnections between components are defined. Allowing a user to graphically model a future system of components therefore allows the user to select which components to use and therefore defines the connections between the components.

8. Applicant further argues claims 24, 27, 32, 35, 39, 42 and 44 contain similar limitations to claim 1 and therefore are allowable. Examiner respectfully disagrees, see above arguments.

9. Applicant further argues Hanagan does not disclose or suggest limitations of claim 12. Specifically: "Hanagan gives no disclosure as to whether the components may be implemented on separate component processing systems" (pg 20, lines 7-8).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim language recites: "the components being implemented by component processing systems" (Claim 12, lines 1-2), this does

not require that each component be implemented on separate component processing systems. Furthermore, Hanagan disclosed at [0054]: "The components are independent and integrated containing all the necessary processes and inputs and outputs to function independently". Since each component can function independently, each component is a component processing system. Additionally, Hanagan disclosed: "The key is to ensure that each component is an independent and self-contained unit, which by itself, completely performs some set of functions" ([0087], lines 5-7). Each component is therefore its own processing system which performs a set of functions.

10. Applicant further argues: "the Examiner appears to have attributed claimed functionalities to the standardized interfaces of Hanagan, which are not explicitly described or even suggested... For example, the Examiner has asserted that the standardized interfaces represent interconnections which define the transfer of data between the entities of the respective components (claim 1), are equivalent to agents which can cooperate with other agents (claim 16) and that they can also negotiate with agents of other components (claim 47)" (pg 21, second paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The standardized interfaces are provided for each component and include all information that is needed by the sending and receiving components (Hanagan, [0087], lines 9-12). These interfaces therefore define the transfer of data between components (claim 1) because they include the information needed to transfer data. Furthermore, they are agents which cooperate with other agents because each component has a standardized interface and during

communication the standardized interfaces cooperate to communicate. Finally, the standardized interfaces negotiate to allow communication because they contain all the information necessary for communication. The components communicate (see Hanagan, [0076]), and therefore the standardized interfaces must perform the above functions to allow this communication.

11. Applicant further argues amended claim 47 contains subject matter not disclosed by the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay (see pg 20, second paragraph – pg 22). The subject matter of amended claim 47 would require further search and or consideration and therefore the amendment will not be entered.

All arguments have been addressed, and therefore the rejection is maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW S. LINDSEY whose telephone number is (571)270-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7-5, Fridays 7-12.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2451

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSL

11/16/2009

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451